## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION CRIMINAL CASE NO. 1:06-cr-00031-MR-WCM-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	) ) <u>ORDER</u> )
TRACY WILLIAM ALLEN,	)
Defendant.	)
	_ )

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on the Defendant's letter [Doc. 524], which the Court construes as a motion for jail credit.

The Defendant moves the Court to give him sentencing credit for the time that the Defendant spent in the McDowell County Jail after being arrested for a supervised release violation. [Doc. 524]. The Defendant's motion must be denied. The Attorney General, not the sentencing court, is responsible for computing a prisoner's credit. <u>United States v. Wilson</u>, 503 U.S. 329, 335 (1992). A prisoner seeking review of the computation of his sentence credit must first seek administrative review of that computation through the Bureau of Prisoners. Only after such administrative remedies have been exhausted can a prisoner then seek judicial review of his

sentence computation. <u>Id.</u> Further, because "[a] claim for credit against a sentence attacks the computation and execution of a sentence rather than the sentence itself," United States v. Miller, 871 F.2d 488, 490 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989),

such claims must be raised pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 in the district of

confinement. In re Jones, 226 F.3d 328, 332 (4th Cir. 2000); 28 U.S.C. §

2241(a).

Accordingly, the Defendant should address his inquiry regarding the

status of his sentence to the Bureau of Prisons. Once his BOP administrative

remedies have been exhausted, the Defendant may seek judicial review in

the district of his confinement.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Defendant's letter [Doc. 524,

which the Court construes as a motion for jail credit, is **DENIED WITHOUT** 

PREJUDICE.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed: August 28, 2020

Martin Reidinger

Chief United States District Judge

2